

WOMAN'S PROGRESS IN RELATION TO EUGENICS.

By R. MURRAY LESLIE, M.A., B.Sc., M.D., M.R.C.P.

EUGENICS has been defined as the science of racial hygiene, but this now covers such an immense field that I have thought it well to strictly confine my remarks to one aspect of the subject, *viz.*, its relationship to the so-called "woman's progress movement" of to-day.

Let us first consider this woman's movement and all that it implies, and then ask ourselves whether the results of such a movement are favourable or prejudicial to race progress. The wonderful activity in all the relations of life displayed by women is undoubtedly the outstanding social feature of the first decade of the twentieth century. This activity is not confined to any one country, but is being exerted in a greater or less degree all over the civilised world. The so-called weaker sex—unexpressed through the centuries—is now asserting itself with no uncertain voice, and claiming civic and other rights and privileges hitherto considered to be the special prerogatives of man. Amongst a large and ever increasing section of women, more particularly in England and America, there is a revolt against long-imposed restrictions which many of them rightly or wrongly regard as not only unjust but as being directly injurious to half of the human race.

As affording illustrations of the scope of this woman's movement one might point to such phases as the agitation for parliamentary franchise; women's civic duties as Borough and County Councillors; their serving on Royal Commissions; their growing power of organisation for mutual intercourse, assistance and support; their clubs and their congresses; their kicking over the traces of conventionality; their frank discussion of social and political problems; their outspoken criticisms of their former

lords and masters; their claims to economic independence as spinsters, wives and mothers; their demand for moral and religious equality; their refusal to be restricted to the so-called domestic sphere; their demands for equal rights in the marriage state, particularly as regards the guardianship of their children; their free entry into all the professions, vocations, and spheres of labour formerly reserved for men; their demand for female inspection of women workers and for female control of the conditions under which women's industries are carried on; and above all, their free admission to the highest possible intellectual training at colleges and universities, not to speak of their physical exercises and manifold games and recreations.

As a result of all this there has been evolved a new type of woman, who is determined to be independent and have a career of her own, quite apart from any domestic duties which may or may not fall to her lot. The new girl is not only as self-reliant as her brothers, but is often more conversant with new ideas and new movements, and is even occasionally taller and of better physique. She displays a desire for efficiency for its own sake, and is ambitious for a career of her own, independent of that of her brothers and other male belongings. The dramatist—Henry Arthur Jones—said in a recent address, that the new civilisation was fast producing a different type of woman from anything the world had ever known, and that the admirable types of women depicted by Jane Austen, Dickens and Thackeray seemed doomed to extinction.

Having so far cleared the ground, let us now pass on to the more important aspect of our subject, and let us ask ourselves the question: "*Is woman's so-called progress—social and intellectual—conducive to the betterment of the race?*" Are the new women with their larger outlook on life and its problems better fitted than the older types to become the mothers of a stronger and more virile race, able to keep England in its present proud position among the nations of the world?

There is no doubt that the new woman is a more interesting companion than her predecessor, and that she has made great progress in the arts and sciences, in trades and professions, but the question of questions is—is she a better mother of the race?

Does, for instance, her knowledge of mathematics, or even her efficiency in athletics, make her intrinsically a better potential mother than the natural, bright, intelligent girl interested in frocks and frills, dances and mild flirtations? May it not be more important that a girl be intelligent than that she be intellectual? May not life with its daily round of domestic duties and personal experience of social problems be a better school for her growing mind and developing faculties of head and heart than a university class-room presided over by a learned professor steeped in the lore of all the ages?

It cannot be denied that the majority of men, including even learned university professors themselves, exhibit a preference for the less highly educated type. Is intellectuality, then, to stand in the way of opportunities of marriage and maternity? It would almost seem so. At present there appears to be no doubt that the "natural" girl (if I may describe her as such) has more opportunities of marriage than her intellectual sister, for the simple reason that man in his egotism appreciates in a woman what he calls feminine qualities more highly than devotion to intellectual pursuits or even pre-eminence in scholastic attainments.

Charlotte Perkins Gillman would say that all this is due to excessive sex distinction, and that men are still under the thralldom of purely feminine attributes and attractions, from which she hopes they will in time be delivered. Is it not just possible that the average man in his blundering way is right after all, and may he not be unconsciously following Nature's dictates? May it not be that this very sex attraction towards femininity, which Charlotte Perkins Gillman deplors, is the most powerful eugenic factor in existence, and that great intellectual attainments, if they also diminish this attraction, are from a eugenic standpoint a mistake?

It is not indeed a man's intellectual or scientific attainments in themselves that appeal to women but the various qualities, whether physical, intellectual or moral, which constitute "manliness." Now in the case of a man "braininess" is considered an attribute of manliness for the simple reason that even more than good physical development—which all women admire in a man—it implies the possession of power and thus makes its possessor

strong and fit to be a leader of men. It is this power which intellect gives to a man, rather than the intellect itself, which makes the latter quality so important an element in manliness. Most women in their heart of hearts admire a masterful man endowed with power and influence, and secretly despise the "tame cat" type of individual, however amiable or admirable he may be in the domestic sphere. On the other hand, womanliness is dissociated in men's and also in most women's minds with either intellectual power or physical development, but is independent of both and is rightly or wrongly associated with certain passive qualities, such as sympathy and tenderness, more emotional than intellectual in character, which best find their expression in the domestic sphere and more particularly in the rôles of wife and mother. It was her sympathy rather than her intellect which made Florence Nightingale the power she became.

May it not be that the "manliness" of men (as judged by women) and the "womanliness" of women (as judged by men) are after all the most valuable of all qualities from the standpoint of Eugenics, being but the modern expression of Natural Selection? If this be so, let men be manly and women womanly at all costs: everything else is incidental. I have not attempted to give the definition of the two terms, as they connote a group of attributes which one feels to be true but cannot express in so many words.

There may be more truth than we moderns imagine in the old dictum that for the best mating the man and the woman should have complementary qualities.

However fit the new woman may be physically, morally and intellectually, it is not of very much consequence to the race if she is deprived of the opportunity of becoming herself the mother of the fittest.

Laura Moorholm Hansson states that during the period of intellectual tension, as with girls preparing for examination, their sex is silent, and it is well it should be so; but is it equally advisable that such intellectual strain should be kept up for prolonged periods, even during the larger part of the reproductive lifetime, so that the emotions are starved out of existence, or if they do wake up it is too late, after youth has fled?

Pent-up emotions with no legitimate outlets, and denied opportunities of fruition, not infrequently terminate in morbid developments which may lead to psychic and mental disaster.

Herbert Spencer's *Law of Multiplication* indicates the existence of an inverse ratio between individuation and genesis, and asserts that "*the higher the standard of the individual life the lower will be the birth-rate.*"

Those women whose parenthood is most desirable are found to be least fertile, not only for organic reasons, but, as we shall presently show, because they marry later. Does it not follow that an intellectual pursuit which makes a girl unfit for or averse to motherhood is scarcely one that can in the eugenic sense be described as the Higher Education? A recent writer has stated that "it is of little use that a girl has been a high wrangler at Cambridge, or has even played centre-forward at hockey, if she cannot nurse her baby, or even produce one."

On all hands it is admitted that intellectual creativeness, or originality, whether in music, poetry, painting, science, or even in the art of dress, is the special prerogative of men. Is this not so because Dame Nature has wisely willed that woman's creativeness shall be expressed otherwise, and in an infinitely more important direction, and may it not be that any attempt to foster her intellectual at the expense of her racial creativeness is essentially wrong, if it acts as a bar to race progress?

The higher education of women should be essentially different from that of men. Lord Curzon lately delivered an address at Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, and expressed the opinion that it was the duty of every friend and sympathiser of the women's movement, while there was yet time, to sketch out a plan of action for the future, and to suggest those spheres of occupation and activity which were likely to be suitable for women. We want to have done with what Mr. G. K. Chesterton describes as "plodding, elaborate and elephantine imitation." The present system of education has been designed as if men and women were more or less alike, whereas they are essentially different. There is no question of superiority, each being superior in a different sphere. The occasional production of a senior classic at Oxford, or even a senior wrangler at Cambridge, is but a small

thing compared with what might be achieved by a wisely arranged system of education designed to meet a woman's true requirements.

May there not be some truth in the somewhat startling statement made by Dr. F. E. Fremantle at the recent London meeting of the British Medical Association to the effect that "girls' colleges are boasting of the strong, determined, well-equipped young women they turn out prepared to face the battles of life, at the same time forgetting that when girls are so prepared they are wholly unprepared for married life? Their ideal seems to be to enable the girl to try and beat the man at his own game, the corollary being that she gets out of practice at her own. The appetites of girls are being whetted for distractions which, however harmless or even useful in themselves, serve to unfit them for domestic duties." At the same meeting Dr. J. W. Ballantyne—the acknowledged authority on ante-natal pathology—pointed out that in America the higher education of women has had a distinct influence in diminishing the birth-rate, and that the college-trained girl has certainly not been the mother of many children. The same observer has noticed a lack of capacity in young athletic women to nurse their babies, and instances the case of a woman hockey player who had informed him of the fact that nearly all her fellow players had the experience after marriage of being unable to suckle their infants.

It has not indeed yet been scientifically proved that prolonged study in any special direction actually conduces to a better all-round development of a woman's brain than does the ordinary round of domestic and social duties. The emotional centres may in the former case be partially starved and a lopsided development often results. These remarks do not of course apply to the exceptional woman, who, like all exceptions, must be a law unto herself. The world would indeed have been the poorer if we had not had such women as Madame Curie, Mary Herschell, Lady Mary Wortley Montague, or Florence Nightingale.

In the columns of the *Times* last July there was an interesting correspondence on the physiological aspect of the question

which provoked much comment and discussion. Dr. Leonard Williams contended that the whole of the physiological life of woman during the reproductive period, including, as it does, complicated cyclical processes, makes such heavy demands upon the female nervous system as to leave too scant a margin for the rough and tumble of life and more particularly for intellectual work, which exerts such an exacting and exhausting influence on the nervous system. He asserted that her engaging in outside undertakings makes illegitimate demands upon the store of nervous energy, which is in her case deliberately set aside by nature for the perpetuation of the race. Dr. Ethel Vaughan-Sawyer indignantly characterises the above statement as being absolutely false and misleading, and states that there is a surplus of energy stored for potential motherhood, which can and should be usefully turned to other ends, and that it is the absence of outlets for these energies which is at the root of many of the evils from which women suffer. Speaking as a physician, my experience leads me to believe that Dr. Leonard Williams' view is extreme, and scarcely warranted by facts. A woman's store of reserve vitality is, as a rule, greater than a man's, as any physician experienced in the treatment of acute disease can testify. Whether intellectual pursuits are, or are not, compatible with physiological health, I think all doctors, whether men or women, will admit that it is extremely unwise during early adolescence—a period of extreme physiological stress—to overtax the physical and nervous energy of growing girls and quite young women. Surely it is not necessary for a girl to acquire all her intellectual culture before marriage. Would it not be better to postpone many studies until a later period when the active reproductive life lies behind: there is then much less risk in women developing themselves and their faculties to the utmost. In this connection I may quote the words of Mrs. Mary Scharlieb—one of the ablest of the modern school of women doctors—who says in regard to this question: "It is a matter of the deepest interest to the community that we should know whether modern education is likely to lead to the evolution of a more efficient race, or whether its results are likely to be shown in an increase of nervous disorders and mental disaster."

These are weighty words from one who is herself in the advance guard of woman's progress, and has had unrivalled opportunities of observing the effects of higher education in all its bearings. Certainly I have had under my own personal care not a few girls, the victims of neurasthenia, whose nervous systems have been affected, and in some cases permanently injured by too close an application to intellectual pursuits. A woman cannot altogether cut herself off from certain home duties, and thus has to bear a double burden, which is often too much for her strength. A successful woman journalist recently stated that very few women are really fitted to stand the strain of prolonged competitive employment.

The report of the Lunacy Commission issued in January, 1910, states that in every class of the insane the number of females is much higher than that of the males. It is interesting to note that at the top of the list come women who have been engaged in intellectual pursuits. Thus female authors, journalists and secretaries have an incidence of 56 per 100,000, while among male authors and journalists the incidence is only 16 or less than a third. On the other hand, amongst female indoor domestic servants there is an incidence of only 25 per 100,000. A doctor in Finland in a recent publication states that since women have entered more largely into the public and political life of the country, there has been a considerable increase of insanity amongst the female population.

It is impossible, nor would it be advisable, to attempt to check woman's intellectual development, but might it not be scientific to suggest that there may be certain intellectual pursuits less likely than others, as being more congenial, to be associated with sex starvation and sterility? May it not be that woman's determination to invade *all* the spheres of men's activity is fundamentally wrong and prejudicial to her own best interests? May there not be after all a scientific "woman's sphere" outside the bounds of which she goes at her own peril?

As Geddes and Thomson pointed out, the male is naturally active or katabolic and the female passive or anabolic, and, accordingly, *to foist excessive katabolic activity on an anabolic organism is not only unscientific but may be fraught with possible disaster.*

Those occupations may be best for a woman which are most congenial and least interfere with her feminine attractiveness, since charm of personality will ever be a woman's greatest asset, and it is certainly that which gives her most power in influencing both men and women. One would be inclined to think that occupations which give full scope for the expression of her emotional and imaginative faculties, may be more natural than those of a pure scientist or politician, as being more congenial and more in consonance with her true nature.

I would suggest that a *Law of Consonance* be enunciated to the effect that "*a woman should only develop intellectually along lines that are consonant with the natural development of her capacity for race creativeness.*" These lines will vary with different individuals. Many women will of course decline to acknowledge limitations of any kind, but even here they will at all events know the risk they are running. Many, too, will no doubt be prepared to take the risk, as marriage and maternity are no longer regarded by many modern women as the aims and ends of life, which they believe to be quite secondary to their ability to contribute their quota to intellectual, moral and social progress. But again I recall the fact that I am speaking only from the standpoint of Eugenics.

A very useful function of the Eugenics Education Society would be to draw up a complete list of the pursuits for women that are least likely to be harmful to the parental instinct and capacity, and place them more or less in order of consonance. For each individual the degree of congeniality is probably the best test of consonance that can be employed. The new census returns may yield valuable information and throw a new light on this aspect of the question.

There are those who regard the diminishing birth-rate as a sign of racial progress, as the gain in quality would, in their opinion, more than compensate for the loss of quantity. I am inclined to join issue with such and to agree with their critics in stating that the further one goes into the details of the dwindling birth-rate among the better classes the more suggestive of impending disaster it seems. Mr. Roosevelt's warnings to France and England in regard to the diminishing birth-rate, are still

ringing in our ears. Our best instincts tell us that this earnest, fearless man is right in his main contention, and that in shirking maternity the modern woman runs the risk of bartering her birth-right in return for a life of luxury and self-gratification, even should this take the form of self-culture. If England is to maintain her place among the nations the spirit of self-sacrifice must not be replaced by a selfish desire for comfort, ease, and well-being, things not wrong in themselves, but from a eugenic point of view unworthy to be the chief aims and ambitions of a great people.

Prof. Pearson admits that the physically inferior and mentally slow are the most fertile in our own community to-day, and that a process of race deterioration is already in progress. To check this movement is the special function of practical Eugenic action, for we wish the fit, not the unfit, women of England to be the mothers of its future sons and daughters. The professional marriage rate in this country is only half that of the industrial classes, and as the rate of reproduction of the industrial classes is 30 per cent. greater, Society must necessarily under the present conditions recruit itself from below, instead of doing so from the group with the most desirable national characteristics.

The most prominent advocates of Women's Suffrage expect that the securing of the parliamentary vote will lead to increased sense of national responsibility on the part of women.

I very much doubt if the franchise, whether desirable or not on other grounds, will exert any beneficial influence in the special direction under discussion. A number of ardently enthusiastic suffragists are, indeed, avowedly advocates of Neo-Malthusian principles, and it is a noteworthy fact that in Finland and Australia—two countries which enjoy women's suffrage—the birth-rate is almost the lowest in the civilised world. I had recently a conversation with a Melbourne physician, who said that the Medical Faculty there consider the steadily diminishing birth-rate to be by far the greatest social and national problem in Australia. In America, too, where women are more highly cultured than their brothers, and in France, where women take such an active part in the business of the country, a similar state

of matters has to be recorded ; whereas it is far otherwise in such countries as Germany, where the mass of women are still mainly confined to the domestic sphere.

The German Emperor, who might be described as the modern apostle of efficiency, in a recent message delivered on August 25th, to the women of Germany, stated that the chief duty of women consisted not in attending meetings and joining organisations but in placid work in their homes and families. In commenting on this statement, one of the leading organs of the Berlin press states that Germans in an overwhelming majority share the Kaiser's view that woman's place is in the home and not in the outside turmoil, and adds that in taking this stand against the destructive tendency which the feminist movement would, in his opinion, introduce into public life, the Kaiser rightfully interprets the public sentiments of his country. Nowadays English and American women are apt to smile derisively when a German woman is mentioned, the word "Hausfrau" being in their minds synonymous with all that is dull, dowdy and stodgy. There is a proverb, however, to the effect that "he laughs best who laughs last." In England and America the cult of the "smart" and the "modern" at the expense of the things that are fundamental is fraught with real danger to the State. A recent writer states, as the result of a wide personal experience, that Germany to-day presents the highest type of family life that any nation has so far evolved and adds that the family and State work hand in hand for the honour and glory of their fatherland. The Kaiser believes that the sphere of feminine influence should be restricted to the four "Ks," "Kirche, Kuche, Kinder and Kleider," and Miss Alice Ravenhill admits that these may be stretched to include the whole range of female activities.

One of the most striking, and probably one of the most important, results of the present demand for Higher Education and culture has been the growing tendency to postpone the marriage age among women of the educated classes. At a recent meeting of the British Medical Association, Dr. D. W. Hunter, of the Royal Albert Asylum, Lancaster, arrived at the following interesting conclusions as the result of a comprehensive study of the

families of nearly 2,000 parents. He found that children born at either end of the reproductive period are liable to be defectively developed. He states that at 24 to 25 years of age a woman is best fitted to give birth to her first-born, while after 25 years of age the capacity of bearing a good first-born child diminishes. On the other hand, if the first-born is produced at about the age of 25 the power to reproduce good children will steadily increase with each pregnancy until the mother reaches the age of 37, after which it rapidly diminishes. If this be true the obvious inference is that a woman, however educated and cultured she may be, who marries—say after 30 years of age—necessarily misses the opportunity of giving birth to the best child of which she is capable.

Dr. Prudence Gaffikin, as a result of extensive investigations in connection with the County Council school children at Enfield, has shown that the quality of the child improves up to the sixth or seventh member of the family, and then diminishes. As the families of educated women rarely number more than two or three, the nation is necessarily deprived of the best children, namely the third to the sixth. It thus follows that not only is the race being mainly recruited from the lower grades of society but the educated classes are not even producing the best of their kind. Another result of the engagement of women in intellectual and outside pursuits, is the present tendency to increase the intervening period between successive children with the object of lessening as far as possible the woman's incapacity for work. The ordinary lactational interval between a birth and a subsequent conception is advisable on all grounds, but Dr. Hunter has shown that a lengthy period of sterility, whether artificial or natural, lowers the quality of the child born subsequently. Thus Neo-Malthusian doctrines are directly opposed to the production of the fittest.

Over and over again I have heard the modern woman say, that as it is women who bear the children it is for them to say when they shall marry and how many children they shall have, and this not from the point of view of what will or will not be good for the nation, which concerns them very little, if at all, but from that of their own personal convenience. During the last

few months, no fewer than three young brides, all splendid specimens of humanity, frankly and deliberately stated in my consulting room that they did not want to have children, partly for economic reasons and partly because of possible interference with their social duties and recreations. I am stating facts, I leave my readers to draw their own conclusions. The fact that the husband often aids and abets in the conspiracy does not affect the main argument.

I should be the last to wish that the interesting, independent English girl of to-day—the finest product of the ages—should revert to the mere “Hausfrau.” I am only asking her not to sacrifice her race in her efforts to secure her own self-development. The Eugenist sees in her the probable ancestress of the finest race the world has ever seen, if she will only realise her unrivalled opportunity.

This brings us to the bright side of the picture. The improved physique of the modern woman is largely the result of regulated physical training. Modern teachers are now exercising great care in considering the needs and limitations of the individual girl, so that physical training, excellent though it be, shall not be carried to excess. This is very necessary, as excessive physical exercise is even more harmful than too close an application to intellectual pursuits.

The modern girl is often a fascinating personality, and is noted for her broad, healthy outlook on life, her knowledge of current events and social problems, her sympathetic understanding, her enthusiastic advocacy of whatever promotes the physical and moral welfare of the community, and her all-round efficiency in many directions. These qualities have, many of them, a distinct social, racial and Eugenic value.

There is no reason why such qualities should not co-exist with feminine charm and sex attractiveness. It is of prime importance to mould public opinion as to the qualities that are socially and racially desirable. Fashion is so powerful that what the leaders of society value most, other women soon find desirable also. Sir Francis Galton states that the essentially desirable race qualities are, a healthy body, a sound mind with superior intelligence, and a natural capacity and zeal for work.

If the race is to include an increasing number of persons having these desirable characteristics this can only occur through a "selective birth-rate." What part, then, are educated, cultured, well-informed women to play in this connection? It would indeed be difficult to exaggerate the enormous influence they can wield. In the first place, there is no doubt that as girls go out more into the world and mix more freely with men and women, each will have many more opportunities of meeting, on an equal footing, different types of men, and of recognising and differentiating the fit from the unfit, and will be less and less driven to the necessity of accepting the first socially eligible man who presents himself, whatever his character may be. Her strong, vigorous, intelligent personality will refuse to mate with the unfit and will indignantly reject the vicious, the diseased, and the degenerate. She is becoming alive to the disastrous effects of immorality both in regard to degeneration and fertility. Her influence will gradually level up men to her own social and ethical standard, and it lies with her to say what that standard is to be.

Further, as woman becomes economically more independent, she will, it is affirmed, get the power of mate selection more and more into her own hands. It is well known that women have better powers of observation and have a much more highly developed sense of personality than men, and if all-round intelligence and knowledge of the world, rather than book lore, be superadded, they will obviously be better fitted for the task of mate selection than men, most of whom must be specialists if they are to succeed in life. Further, it is also a matter of common knowledge that women are far more influenced by character in a man than by personal appearance. The virile, healthy, clever man of strong character, who is also tender and considerate, appeals to women much more strongly than mere personal beauty. In fact, a beautiful man is an anachronism in a woman's eyes. She appreciates the above-mentioned attributes—which are at the same time racially desirable—from an intuitive instinct compelling her to endow her unborn child with the highest qualities obtainable. "With the majority of women," says George Romanes, "character is the important factor in life."

In a company of women, not long ago, I heard the following statement made, which was accepted as true by common consent: *A woman often regards a man, not so much from the point of view of a possible husband, as that of the possible father of her child, and it is his apparent fitness for this function that is the criterion of his desirability.* Nearly every woman has an intuitive belief in the importance of a good heredity and desires that her child shall be physically and mentally the best possible. If the modern woman uses her influence to make such a conviction universal she will subserve the best interests of Eugenics. At the same time, such selection must not degenerate into the vice of hyper-fastidiousness, and it must be remembered that the ideal standard of perfection is very rarely met with, either in men or women. The race must be built up with the best material available.

The modern woman's qualities of heart need not in any way be impaired by the fact that she is sensible enough to perceive the necessity of her suitor having adequate means for her support and of his being sound in body and mind. She will probably be glad if he will insure his life, which will have the effect of easing her mind in two respects: firstly, by giving her the knowledge that she is provided for in the event of his death, and secondly, by assuring her that he is in good health, and consequently that her children will be born strong and healthy.

As regards the question of environment and kindred matters indirectly affecting Eugenics there is no doubt that much modern social and educational progress has been initiated by the pioneers of the woman's progress movement. By moulding public opinion and by making external conditions such that the highest possible development of the individual becomes possible, these women have rendered indirect assistance of incalculable value to the cause of Eugenics. In the first place, they have conspicuously exposed the falsity of the doctrine that ignorance and innocence are identical. It is now recognised by our educational authorities and reiterated at every educational congress that no young adolescent, whether boy or girl—should go out into the world ignorant of the wonderful mechanism of their bodies or of the elementary facts regarding the transmission of life. All instruc-

tion should be if possible authoritative. Girls should come to school with an elementary sex knowledge derived from their mothers, and the instruction be continued by a responsible school mistress, or better still, by a lady health lecturer—married if possible—with a sound knowledge of Physiology and Hygiene. The benefits of such right teaching, as compared with the present system of perverted knowledge derived from undesirable sources, are self-evident. An elementary knowledge of the existence and communicability of contagious disease is also advisable. The Eugenic education of girls should present no difficulties, as the idea of motherhood is perfectly natural to normal girls. But the educational work of the modern woman must not stop here. In educational centres a girl must be taught something of the duties of motherhood. She must be taught the inestimable importance of a mother nursing her own child, and some knowledge must be given her of the numerous ailments and diseases of children which are due to artificial feeding. She will then be less likely to be led astray later on by the pernicious advice of society friends, who so often tell young prospective mothers not to nurse their children as it might spoil their figures, or tempt them from the path of duty by some equally frivolous argument. She must be taught the principal facts regarding the rearing of children and the best methods of developing a child's faculties of body and mind. This is the true higher education. Girls are only beginning to realise that by marrying and bearing children without making some previous preparation for the task, they are incurring a very grave responsibility. Some of the leaders of the "new woman movement" are strong advocates of the State endowment of maternity, so that whatever her financial position may be, a woman shall have adequate nourishment and attention and no pecuniary worries during the performance of her great race function. Maternity clubs, with the object of protecting pregnancy, are springing up everywhere. Many women feel that a scheme for endowment of maternity should have preceded old age pensions as being infinitely more valuable from the national point of view. Modern women are insisting even more strongly than men on the segregation of the feeble-minded and degenerate in communities where they will be treated with every

care and attention, but where they will have no opportunities for parenthood, which if permitted would only result in the perpetuation of the unfit. All this serves to show that many cultured women are not unmindful of woman's greatest function, no inconsiderable part of their activities being directed towards improving the conditions appertaining to maternity. They take an active part on the Central Midwives Board, they are prominent members of the Society for the Study of Childhood, they are doing excellent work as School Doctors and Health Visitors, while still others, like Miss Ethel Elderton, have conducted valuable scientific investigations in the cause of Eugenics.

The modern woman believes with Ibsen that she is first of all a human being and then a woman. This may be true, but at the same time let her not forget that she is a woman as well.

Nietzsche says: "The perfect woman is a higher and rarer type of humanity than the perfect man, but at the same time her influence can only be rightly exercised with the support and co-operation of man."

Man is even more necessary to woman than woman is to man. Apart from his value as a co-worker it is he alone who can unlock the door that gives her access to the great realm where woman reigns supreme, and in which she attains her truest and highest development. In any case, there must be no sex warfare, but both man and woman must work together towards the realisation of the highest ideals. This co-operation will be all the more effective when the sphere of each is better defined and the element of competitive rivalry is thereby removed or diminished in intensity.

"The ideal woman," according to Tolstoy, "will be the one who, having assimilated the highest life-conception and life faith that she is acquainted with, abandons herself to the feminine instincts irresistibly implanted in her mind, and produces, rears and educates children capable of working for the good of mankind according to the life-conception she has assimilated."